

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, and 14-23 are now pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 14, and 18 are rejected. Claims 15-17 are objected to. Claims 3-13 have been withdrawn. Claims 3-13 are cancelled herein. New claims 20-23 are added. Claims 1, 2, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are amended herein to place them in better form.

Claims 1, 2, 14, and 18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,354,273 (Imura et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,477,829 (Hassinger et al.). To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, it is necessary to show that all the claim limitations are taught or suggested by the prior art. *See In re Royka and Martin*, 180 USPQ 580, 583 (CCPA 1974); MPEP § 2143.03.

Claim 1 recites two wall surfaces at short sides being flat. The cross-section of Figure 5(D) of Imura et al. does not disclose or suggest a flat shape at the short sides of the cross-section.

Claim 1 recites a flexible absorbing wall surface is furnished by first two wall surfaces to absorb pulsation by deformation upon receiving pressure in association with fuel injection, said first two wall surfaces being at long sides of the cross section. In column 5, lines 41-49 of Imura et al. is a description of the surfaces that are flexible and which are absorbing in Figure 5(D). Imura et al. lists surfaces 62a, 62b, and 62c as flexible absorbing surfaces. The Office

Action has not identified any disclosure or suggestion in Imura et al. that the side corresponding to the socket attachment (a long side) absorbs pulsation by deformation. Furthermore, even if Imura et al. disclosed the side corresponding to the socket attachment as absorbing pulsation, the amount of such pulsation would be significantly smaller than the pulsation absorbed by the first two wall surfaces recited in claim 1. Accordingly, for the aforementioned reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Imura et al. in view of Hassinger et al. Claims 2, 4, and 18 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim. *See In re Fine*, 5 USPQ2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988); MPEP § 2143.03.

The Office Action states that claim 1 does not require that the injectors be mounted to the shorter wall. Dependent claim 20 has been added and it recites that the socket for connecting each injection nozzle is secured to either of second two wall surfaces, said second two wall surfaces being being flat. The combination of Imura et al. in view of Hassinger et al. fails to disclose or suggest this limitation.

Claims 15-17 have been objected to as depending from a rejected base claim but deemed to contain allowable subject matter. Claim 15 is an independent claim and claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to claims 15-17 be withdrawn and that claims 15-17 be allowed.

Claim 19 has not been rejected by the Office Action. Accordingly, claim 19 is deemed allowable and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

New claims 20-23 have been added, support being found in the claims as filed and in Figure 2 of the specification. Claim 23 reads on Figure 2, which corresponds to the first embodiment which was elected for prosecution. Accordingly, claim 23 should be examined in this application. Claims 20-22 are patentable at least for the reason that they depend from a patentable base claim. Claim 23 is patentable at least because the cited art fails to disclose or suggest all of the limitations of claim 23.

Since the present application is a national stage application of a PCT application, the priority documents were filed with the International Bureau. The Examiner is respectfully requested to obtain the priority documents from the PCT/designated office unit in the U.S. Patent Office and acknowledge receipt thereof in the next Office Action.

Applicant respectfully requests a two month extension of time for responding to the Office Action. **The fee of \$450.00 for the extension is provided for in the charge authorization presented in the PTO Form 2038, Credit Card Payment form, provided herewith.**

If there is any discrepancy between the fee(s) due and the fee payment authorized in the Credit Card Payment Form PTO-2038 or the Form PTO-2038 is missing or fee payment via the Form PTO-2038 cannot be processed, the

USPTO is hereby authorized to charge any fee(s) or fee(s) deficiency or credit any excess payment to Deposit Account No. 10-1250.

In light of the foregoing, the application is now believed to be in proper form for allowance of all claims and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,  
JORDAN AND HAMBURG LLP

By C. Bruce Hamburg  
C. Bruce Hamburg  
Reg. No. 22,389  
Attorney for Applicants  
*BH* and,

By Ricardo Unikel  
Ricardo Unikel  
Reg. No. 52,309  
Attorney for Applicants

Jordan and Hamburg LLP  
122 East 42nd Street  
New York, New York 10168  
(212) 986-2340

enc: Form PTO-2038